

REMARKS

This is responsive to the office action dated November 30, 2006. Claims 1-5 and 7-15 are pending. Claims 12-15 have been cancelled by this amendment, leaving claims 1-5 and 7-11. Amendments have been presented, and applicants respectfully submit that the present case is now in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 requires a first and second server and plural client computers. Three types of information are transmitted from the second server to the first server. First, personalization information for the second server. Second, personalization information for several of the client computers. Third, personalization information that applies to only one client computer. This claimed subject matter corresponds to the disclosure at pp. 11-13.

This allows a server to personalize itself, and to also efficiently personalize plural clients by downloading and duplicating information that applies to plural such clients, and by also downloading and then transmitting information that applies to each individual client. Thus, the information downloaded is hybrid, in a sense, and includes information for a server, information for individualized client computers connected to that server, and information applicable to numerous client computers connected to that server. This subject matter is not disclosed in East or in Capps.

East does not teach gathering personalization information from computers and then configuring new ones similarly. Instead, East teaches that software updates and other information can be propagated through a network from an administrator, down to the client computers, using a hierarchical method. (See, e.g.; Abstract and Paragraph 8). East teaches to simply propagate *the same* information through to the client computers.

Capps teaches to store an individualized configuration file for each client. However,

even Capps in combination with East would at best store an individualized file for each client computer that could be propagated. Such a system would not result in three different types of information, as claimed in claim 1, some of which applies to the server, other of which applies to plural clients, and a third type of which only applies to one client. Moreover, claim 7 now also requires that some but not all of the personalization information for a client is common to plural clients, so that the common personalization information, server personalization information, and personalization information unique to a particular client is downloaded to a server, used to personalize it, and then propagated to the clients, wherein part of the propagated information is used to personalize plural client computers, and other parts of it are used to personalize only one client computer.

These features are neither shown nor remotely suggested in the art of record. They are described at least at pp. 12-14 of the present application. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. In the event there are any fees due and owing in connection with this matter, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 11-0223.

Dated: September 7, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: s/Jeffrey I. Kaplan/

Jeffrey I. Kaplan

Registration No.: 34,356

KAPLAN GILMAN GIBSON & DERNIER LLP

900 Route 9 North, Suite 504

Woodbridge, New Jersey 07095

(732) 634-7634

Attorneys for Applicant